

- 5 -

### Remarks

The present response is to the Office Action mailed the above-referenced case on March 31, 2006, made non-final. Claims 1-3, 5-7 and 13-17 are standing for examination. Claims 1-3, 5-7 and 13-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Claims 1-3, 5-7 and 13-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chiang et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0221292), hereinafter Chiang, in view of Britton, (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0178170), hereinafter Britton and further in view of Fontana et al. (WO 9/15986) hereinafter Fontana.

Applicant has carefully studied the references provided by the Examiner one more time, and the Examiner's rejections and statements of the instant Office Action. On page 11 of the Office action the Examiner remarks in paragraph 19, the Examiner states that the recitation of "at least two legacy systems" is not given patentable weight, because the recitation occurs in the preamble. The applicant has caused the independent claims 1 and 13 to be amended in this response to positively recite "...two or more legacy systems".

For the reasons outlined above by applicant, and the amendments to the independent claims, applicant believes that independent claims 1 and 13 now clearly and unarguably differentiate over the prior art references presented by the Examiner either singly or in combination. Depending claims 2-7 and 14-17 are then patentable on their own merits, or at least as depended from a patentable claim.

As all of the claims standing for examination have been shown to be patentable as amended and argued over the art of record, applicant respectfully requests

- 6 -

reconsideration, that the prior art references be withdrawn, and that the present case be passed quickly to issue.

Applicant requests the Examiner review the submission filed February 21, 2002, which requested correction of the foreign priority claim. Submitted with the filing was a letter to the Examiner, Preliminary Amendment correcting the cross-reference, IDS, substitute Declaration, and certified copy of the Indian provisional patent. Applicant requests that correction be made to the foreign priority claim.

If there are any time extensions needed beyond any extension specifically requested with this response, such extension of time is hereby requested. If there are any fees due beyond any fees paid with this amendment, authorization is given to deduct such fees from deposit account 50-0534.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Vinay Vasant Kulkarni et al.

By /Donald R. Boys/  
Donald R. Boys  
Reg. No. 35,074

Central Coast Patent Agency  
P.O. Box 187  
Aromas, CA 95004  
(831) 726-1457